



1897

A Grammatical, Lexical, Exgetical, and General Treatise on the First Epistle General of John

John Wilbert Barnett
Butler University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.butler.edu/mantheses>



Part of the [Biblical Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Barnett, John Wilbert, "A Grammatical, Lexical, Exgetical, and General Treatise on the First Epistle General of John" (1897). *Manuscript Thesis Collection*. 12.
<https://digitalcommons.butler.edu/mantheses/12>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Manuscript Thesis Collection at Digital Commons @ Butler University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Manuscript Thesis Collection by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ Butler University. For more information, please contact digitalscholarship@butler.edu.

Butler University Early Theses Collection

Summary

Volume of Collection

8 boxes, 154 folders

Collection Dates

1887 – 1911

Scope and Content Note

The collection contains early theses manuscripts from Butler University dating from 1887 until 1911 on subjects including Literature, Religion, Science, Greek and Latin. Until 1897 Butler required all students, including undergraduates, to write a theses statement in order to receive a degree. One year after Butler University joined the University of Indianapolis and became Butler College the theses requirement for undergraduate students was dropped. Postgraduate theses are available in this collection ending in 1911. While the majority of these manuscripts are handwritten, as early as 1908 graduate students were required to type theses statements.

A Grammatical, Lexical, Exegetical,
And General Treatise on "The First
Epistle General of John." #

A Thesis for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

by

John Hilbert Barnett A.M.

Columbus, Ohio.

— Cap. I: 1-4. —

1. ὃ ἦν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, ὃ ἀκηκόαμεν, ὃ ἑώρακάμεν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς ἡμῶν, ὃ ἰδεσάμεθα καὶ αἱ χεῖρες ἡμῶν ἐψηλάφησαν, περὶ τοῦ λόγου τῆς ζωῆς. 2. καὶ ἡ ζωὴ ἐφανερώθη, καὶ ἑώρακάμεν καὶ μαρτυροῦμεν καὶ ἀπαγγέλλομεν ὑμῖν τὴν ζωὴν τὴν αἰώνιον, ἥτις ἦν πρὸς τὸν πατέρα καὶ ἐφανερώθη ἡμῖν. 3. ὃ ἑώρακάμεν καὶ ἀκηκόαμεν, ἀπαγγέλλομεν καὶ ὑμῖν, ἵνα καὶ ὑμεῖς κοινωνίαν ἔχητε μεθ' ἡμῶν. καὶ ἡ κοινωνία δὲ ἡ ἡμετέρα μετὰ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ μετὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. 4. καὶ ταῦτα γράφομεν ὑμῖς ἵνα ἡ χαρὰ ἡμῶν ᾖ πεπληρωμένη.

— Parallel Passages. —

1st Epistle

Gospel.

V. 1. ἀπ' ἀρχῆς.

I: 2. ἐν ἀρχῇ.

1. ὃ ἑθεασάμεθα.

II: 14. ἑθεασάμεθα τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ.

1. τοῦ λόγου τῆς ζωῆς.

I: 1-4. ὁ λόγος — ἐν αὐτῇ ζωῇ ἐστὶν καὶ ἡ ζωὴ ἦν τὸ φῶς τῶν ἀνθρώπων.

2. ἡ ζωὴ ἐφανερώθη.

I: 5. τὸ φῶς ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ φαίνει.

2. πρὸς τὸν πατέρα.

I: 2. πρὸς τὸν θεόν.

4. ἵνα ἡ χαρὰ ἡμῶν ᾖ πεπληρωμένη.

II: 11. ἵνα ἡ χαρὰ ἡ ἐμὴ ἐν ὑμῖν καὶ ἡ χαρὰ ὑμῶν πληρωθῇ.

II: 24. ἵνα ἡ χαρὰ ὑμῶν ᾖ πεπληρωμένη.

II: 13. ἵνα ἔχωσιν τὴν χαρὰν τὴν ἐμὴν πεπληρωμένην ἐν αὐτοῖς.

— Grammatical and Lexical. —

Ver 1. John introduces the λόγος with the article ὁ rather than with the masculine οὗς as we would expect.

ὁ is connected with περὶ τοῦ λόγου τῆς ζωῆς.

— ἀπ' ἀρχῆς. He uses ἀπ' ἀρχῆς here rather than ἐν ἀρχῇ as in the Gospel, the reference being rather to the manifestation of the λόγος to the world than to his pre-existence as is expressed in ἐν ἀρχῇ.

— ἀκηκόαμεν - ἐωράκαμεν - ἐθεασάμεθα - ἐψηλάφησαν.

Note 1st He uses the plural "we".

2nd That ἀκηκόαμεν and ἐωράκαμεν are perfects while ἐθεασάμεθα and ἐψηλάφησαν are aorists.

In this climax the perfects have a present signification - "we have heard and have seen with our eyes" - therefore - we know. The hearing and the seeing were completed acts. But now as though this was not sufficient he adds by the aorists how he had had continuous intercourse in the most direct way for the purpose of confirming the reality and nature of the λόγος.

3rd That ἐωράκαμεν is intensified by the addition of τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς ἡμῶν, and ἐψηλάφησαν by αἱ χεῖρες ἡμῶν.

— περὶ τοῦ λόγου τῆς ζωῆς. He would naturally have expected the accusative here in apposition with ὁ rather than περὶ with the Genitive as we have it. This is *partitivus Genitivus*, and this con-

struction is designed against a possible confounding of what is told concerning (περί) the λόγος with the λόγος itself - i.e. of limiting the content of ὁ λόγος to the written or spoken statements of the Gospel.

— The word - ὁ λόγος - is a term that was understood by the people as John used it. cf. the O.P. references. eg. Jer. 1:4. καὶ ἐγένετο λόγος κυρίου πρὸς με, λέγων, and we find λόγος used but without the article, while John always speaks of it as ὁ λόγος. See under General Discussion
— τῆς ζωῆς. is denotative and qualifies τοῦ λόγου.

Ver. 2. καὶ introduces the parenthesis as an explanation and may be translated - indeed - or - for - as we have it in E.V.

— τὴν ζωὴν τὴν αἰώνιον is the subject of the three verbs - ἐωράκαμεν - μαρτυροῦμεν - ἀπαγγέλλομεν. rather than to supply the pronoun "it" after ἐωράκαμεν and make τὴν ζωὴν the subject only of ἀπαγγέλλομεν as in E.V.

— ὅτις ἦν πρὸς τὸν πατέρα. We have ὅτις here instead of the simple relative ὅς, and the German renders it - "as which (i.e. eternal life) it was with the Father".

The use of πρὸς instead of μετὰ seems to have the idea of direction towards - a longing for rather than a position merely alongside of.

Ver. 3. ὁ ἐωράκαμεν etc. Here he again takes up the thought of the beginning, repeating the ἐωράκαμεν and ἀκηκόαμεν in an inverted order from the former verse.

— ἵνα καὶ v. sets forth the purpose of the Apostles' annunciation. καὶ = "also".

Ver. 4. καὶ ταῦτα γράφουσιν ὑμῖς. Again we have the plural "we write" instead of "I write".

The "unto you" of E.V. is lacking in this text.

— ἵνα ἢ κατὰ ἡμῶν. We have ἡμῶν in the text, but some mss. have ἐμῶν. By referring to John 16:24, we find the identical language with ἐμῶν in the text, cf. also Jns. 15:11. & 17:3. in parallel passages. p. 1.

The reading ἡμῶν would mean the joy of the Apostles over the Churches, viz. in that their work was bearing fruit in the lives of their hearers.

Or again, their joy found completeness in telling this to others.

— Exegetical. —

Ver. 1. "What was from the beginning". The author goes back to the beginning. This reminds us of the opening sentence in the Gospel of John - "In the beginning was the word", and also Genesis 1:1. "In beginning God created the heavens and the earth." "From the beginning" refers to the beginning of His manifestation to the world, while "in the beginning" refers clearly to His preexistence. John recognized especially the divinity of Jesus. He says nothing here nor in the Gospel concerning His parents. It is all embraced in the one sentence - "and the word became flesh and dwelt among us". He reaches down more deeply into the spiritual.

— "What." It seems strange that John should introduce the personal "Word" by the Neuter rather than by the Masculine. It may be accounted for by the fact that all through this Epistle, as in all his other writings, John sets forth the "Word" not only as a living individual, but also as "the life" - or the life principle. With this abstract idea he could consistently use the Neuter. But a more satisfactory explanation is in the fact that John's conception of the "Word" was not a complete one, and consequently his description of His character would only be a partial one. It was "that which we have heard - seen - gazed upon - and handled, of (concerning) the

Word of life" So that in setting forth His character in only a partial way He would naturally use the Father.

— "What we have heard, what we have seen, with our eyes, what we have gazed upon, and our hands have handled." This is a rising gradation and sets forth the certainty of the Apostles' annunciation. It begins with hearing the lowest degree of the climax and advances step by step concluding with that nearest and most direct intercourse handled with our hands. John does not announce anything that to him was an uncertainty. He had had a personal relation with the "Word" and was therefore capable of setting Him forth to others.

— "Concerning the word of life." This is the completion of the "what" in the preceding clauses. He is not only "the Word" - but also "the word of the life." He not only has "the words of eternal life" but He is Himself "the word of life." He has the eternal principle of life in Himself, and through Him it is conveyed to us. "He would not come to me in order that ye might have life" Jno. 5:40. And, "I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly" Jno. 10:10.

Ver. 2. "For the life was manifested." This recalls to our minds Jno. 1:4,5 - "And the life was the light of men, and the light shineth in the darkness". The life appeared unto us in human form. The word became flesh and dwelt among us, and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth." Jno. 1:14.

~ "And we have seen and bear witness and announce to you that eternal life". Here John reaffirms the certainty of the annunciation. He was not content with "having seen", but at once "bears testimony" and "announces" to others that which had become precious to him.

~ "which was with the Father and was manifested to us". The seat of this life was with the Father. John, above all the other disciples of our Lord was qualified to bring this message to us.

Ver. 3. "What we have seen and heard." He now goes back and takes up the thought of the beginning, and again states that it had been seen and heard by them.

~ "we declare to you also." John recognized that he did not stand alone in this, but the rest of the early disciples had had a similar experience, and he adds their testimony to his own and writes "we". And not only that, but he recognized in this the saving power of humanity and at once is impelled to carry the

message to others, with this as the purpose:—

—“that ye also may have fellowship with us”. He saw in this the way to his own highest joy and peace. This is the missionary spirit that will carry this message to the world. Then, in order to show them that this was no mere thing, he adds the basis of their fellowship:—

—“And our fellowship indeed is with the Father, and with His Son Jesus Christ.” John at this time had realized the promise of Jesus in Jno. 14: 23, that the Father and He would come and take up their abode with the disciples.

Ver. 4. “And these things we write that our joy may be completed.” He here sets forth his design in writing this Epistle. If we take the reading “our” as it is in this text we can infer that John felt that he had to do all that he could to increase the spiritual life of others in order that he himself might realize complete joy. Of course he realized that it would bring joy to the readers because it would help them to derive life from Christ— to reach that condition of soul health without which there can be no true joy. Their life and joy in Christ was not dependent upon this message. They had the seed of that joy

9.
in themselves, and perfected to the extent to which
they had yielded themselves to God, but it was
not yet completed. They had much yet to learn, and
much of sin to be removed, so that he writes, "may
be completed." "Our joy". I take it that he included
himself and all the disciples in all ages to whom
this comes as a means of lifting them up into
a higher and holier relation to God. John does
not think of this perfection as taking place in-
stantly, but as a continual struggle of the soul
through a long series of successes and defeats,
joys and sorrows, until it stands purified in
the realm of eternal light. —

— General Discussion. —

— ὁ Λόγος. —

We have in the introduction to this Epistle (1:1-4) a three-fold view of the Λόγος:— 1. His pre-existence. 2. His earth-life. 3. His glorified state. The first is set forth in the phrases, ὁ ἦν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς. and ἦτις ἦν πρὸς τὸν πατέρα; the second in ἐφανερώθη and emphasized by ἀκηκόαμεν, ἑωράκαμεν τῆς δόξης τῆς ὁφθαλμοῦς ἡμῶν; ἑώρακάμεθα καὶ αἱ χεῖρες ἡμῶν ἐψηλάφησαν. 1-4 He was made audible, visible and tangible to the children of men; and the third in the phrase ὁιὸς αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

The Bible does not deal very much with His pre-existence, nor with the process by which He emptied himself. It states them simply as facts. It has to do with Him as He was in human conditions, and with the process of His glorification in these human conditions, by which humanity was brought into harmony with divinity.

John deals with the humanity of Jesus, but not in the same way that the other Evangelists do. He sees the Divine in the human and gives especial emphasis to that. He enters into the very essence of His being, and sets it forth not in abstract form, but in a living character. John was able to do this because of the in-

intimate personal relations that he sustained to the Logos. He leaned on his master's bosom, not only at the "last supper", but continuously throughout his whole life, and he allowed his life to flow into him and become his life, so that his testimony is not that of an unconverted teacher, but that of one in whom Christ had been formed. Hence it was joy producing. He sets him forth as the perfected man - the ideal for humanity. He makes us feel the power of divine love set forth in Jesus becoming what we are in order that we might become what He is - in this becoming partaker of our nature in order that we might become partakers of the divine nature.

He sees in the Logos the fullness of God's message to mankind - the means of God to reach humanity and lift it up to Himself. There can be no higher revelation than this, because there can be no greater condescension. We will be constantly learning more of God and the Logos, not because they will condescend to us, but because they will lift us up to them. This process of lifting up is going on now and will continue until it is consummated.

The Logos was not $\delta\theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$. The Logos was $\pi\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$ $\tau\acute{o}\nu\ \theta\epsilon\acute{o}\nu$, and $\theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$ $\hbar\epsilon\gamma\ \delta\ \text{Logos}$. All of $\delta\ \text{Logos}$ is contained in $\theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$, but not all of $\delta\ \theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$ is expressed in $\delta\ \text{Logos}$. Jesus himself says, "My Father is greater than I."
Jno. 14:28.

A Word is the embodiment of an idea or thought; and a thought is an emanation from the individual. We are told in Heb. 1:1-3. that God speaks to man. Now it is necessary, in order that God may communicate with a being who is in a material body and in a material world, that He embody His thought in form.

The *Logos* is an emanation from the divine. cf. Heb. 1:3. ὅς ὡς ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης καὶ χαρακτὴρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ, "who being the brightness of his glory and the express image (Character) of his self-subsistence." Jesus is the Word of God to man. God has expressed Himself to us in the *Logos* so that we can comprehend Him. He is the fullness of all that God would say to man. God had expressed Himself in creation, but "the world through wisdom knew not God". So then "it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe", I Cor. 1:21. 1-6 "He came into a man and filled that man with himself and made him stand out in human life as a revelation and disclosure of Himself" (Dr. Lyman Abbott). And this way God will reach man and lift him up so that he shall partake of the Divine Nature.

— Cap. 1: 5-7. —

5. Καὶ ἔστιν αὕτη ἡ ἀγγελία ἣν ἀκηκόαμεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀναγγέλλομεν
 ὑμῖν, ὅτι ὁ θεὸς φῶς ἐστὶν καὶ σκοτία ἐν αὐτῷ οὐκ ἐστὶν οὐδεμία.
 6. Ἐὰν εἰπώμεν ὅτι κοινωνίαν ἔχομεν μετ' αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐν τῷ σκότει περι-
 πατοῦμεν, ψευδόμεθα καὶ οὐ ποιοῦμεν τὴν ἀλήθειαν. 7. Ἐὰν δὲ ἐν τῷ φωτὶ
 περιπατοῦμεν ὡς αὐτὸς ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ φωτί, κοινωνίαν ἔχομεν μετ' ἀλλήλων
 καὶ τὸ αἷμα Ἰησοῦ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ καθαρῖσει ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ πάσης ἀμαρτίας.

— Parallel passages. —

1st Epistle.

Gospel.

5. Ὁ θεὸς φῶς ἐστὶν καὶ σκοτία
 ἐν αὐτῷ οὐκ ἐστὶν οὐδεμία.

1: 9. Ἦν τὸ φῶς τὸ ἀλήθινον.

8: 12. Ἐγὼ εἰμι τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου.

9: 5. Ὡς εἰμι τοῦ κόσμου.

6. ἐν τῷ σκότει περιπατοῦμεν.

12: 35; 36. περιπατεῖτε ὡς τὸ φῶς ἔχει

7. ἐν τῷ φωτί περιπατοῦμεν ὡς
 αὐτὸς ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ φωτί.

ἵνα μὴ σκοτία ὑμᾶς καταλάβῃ· καὶ οἱ
 περιπατῶν ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ οὐκ οἶδιν ποῦ
 ὑπάγει. ὡς τὸ φῶς ἔχετε, πομπέετε
 εἰς τὸ φῶς, ἵνα υἱοὶ φωτός γενησθε.

— Grammatical and Lexical —

Ver. 5. εἶπεν precedes αὐτοῦ for emphasis. Some mss. have εἶπεν following αὐτοῦ.

— ἀπ' αὐτοῦ. refers to the λόγος of the preceding verses.

— ἀναγγέλλουσιν. instead of ἀπαγγέλλουσιν as in verses 2 and 3. It has the idea of repetition. He had made the announcement to them before and now he makes it again (ἀνά). Also. He not only had heard it, but at once announced it again. —

— ὅτι introduces the message and need not be translated at all - or if translated, translate "that". —

— ὁ θεὸς φῶς ἐστὶν καὶ σκοτία ἐν αὐτῷ οὐκ ἐστὶν ἑσπέρια is the message (αγγελία).

Luther translates. Gott ein Licht ist.

Ver. 6. ἐν τῷ σκότει. "in the darkness". He had just referred to σκοτία in the preceding verses and now he refers to the before mentioned darkness and so uses the article.

— περὶ παρῶμεν - refers to all the actions, both inward and outward, of our life.

— ποιῶμεν τὴν ἀλήθειαν, is a stronger expression than ἀληθεύειν. cf. ἀληθεύοντες δὲ ἐν ἀγάπῃ Eph. 4:15. The idea here is something more than speaking the truth. It must be done.

The clause οὐ ποιῶμεν τὴν ἀλήθειαν is equivalent to the preceding clause ἐν τῷ σκότει περὶ παρῶμεν.

Ver. 7. δέ marks an antithesis with v. 6.

- ~ vs. translate "since" rather than "as" as in G.V. See under Exegetical for the reasons. #
- ~ μετ' ἀλλήλων. The Latin Cod. has μετ' αὐτῶν - evidently changed from the better authenticated reading μετ' ἀλλήλων so as to conform to μετ' αὐτῶν in v.6. The reading μετ' ἀλλήλων gives us an additional thought, and we would naturally expect this.
- ~ τὸ αἷμα Ἰησοῦ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ. Some add Χριστοῦ after Ἰησοῦ. The text from which the R.G. translation was made had that, so that we have "the blood of Jesus Christ his Son".
- ~ καθαρίζει is present tense - "cleanses". Some readings have καθαρίσει or καθαρίει but they lack sufficient authority.
- ~ ἀπὸ πάντων ἀμαρτίας. The Sin. reads ἀμαρτίας ἡμῶν. ἡμῶν is superfluous here. ~

* Exegetical. - *

Ver. 5: "And this is the message which we have heard from him". Not only what He told them by words, but also what they learned from Him in His daily life with them.

— "And announce again to you". Here again we have the thought of others — it was not enough that they should hear the message, but they must tell it again. Or, having orally declared this message to them, he now takes this opportunity to bring it before them again.

— "that God is light" — this is the substance of the message. He does not have any record of Jesus making this statement to the disciples in these words. On the other hand He declared, "I am the light of the world" Jno. 8:12. Christ as the Word of God is "the brightness of His glory and the express image of His self-subsistence" Heb. 1:3. Also Jno. 1:14. "And we beheld His glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father". Or again, "The Word was God". Jesus revealed God to man. What John and the others saw and heard of Jesus led them to the conclusion that "God is light". This statement reminds us of the parallel statement in Cap. 4: 8, 16 — that "God is love". These are the only definitions of God's character that

17
we have. It will not do to say as Luther does "Gott ist ein Licht." - God is a light. That would at once imply that there are other lights independent of Him. God is the author of all light. "the Father of lights" as James puts it; and not only that His very being is light.

~ "And in Him is no darkness at all." By this additional negative clause John emphasizes the former statement. Light and darkness are here brought into contrast as setting forth the character of the two worlds - the world of Light and the world of Darkness. In the former are all things pure and bright and in the latter all things evil. The former is the realm of life and the latter the realm of death.

Before Jesus came we had no such conception of God's character. No philosophy had been able to make such a revelation. The figure is unique and at once gives us the idea of charm, of purity of being and of life. God is the centre and source of all of these. There is no life, no beauty, no purity that does not come from Him. Jesus as "the express image" of God's self-revelation has revealed God's real character to man, and in the light of this character He has revealed man to man and man to himself. He has filled the world with a new life and is purifying it and making it beautiful. It is no wonder

that John makes this the substance of his message. Ver. 6. "If we say that we have fellowship with him and walk in darkness". The author now begins to make some inferences from the message, the first of which is concerning the true fellowship. "God is light". - There is no darkness in Him at all, so that if we would have fellowship with Him we must walk in the light. It is not enough to say, "I have fellowship with Him". There were those in John's day who made this claim, but whose lives said they walked in darkness, and John is here going to refute that idea. It is hypocrisy. We may say this not only by our words, but even by the observance of certain forms which would lead others to think that we are what we are not. A good illustration of this is found in Acts 19:1-7. Paul found certain disciples at Ephesus. He recognized them as disciples by certain forms - e.g. "breaking of bread", but he evidently also recognized in them things not in harmony with the character of the disciples of Jesus, hence his question, "Have ye received the Holy Spirit since ye believed?" And they replied, "We have not so much as heard that there be any Holy Spirit".

~ "He lie and do not the truth." John makes his statements in few words, but always to the

17
faint. If we pretend to be something when we are not we lie. Our life is a lie both to us and to the world. We can only be true and "do the truth" when we walk in the light. Then only can we have fellowship with Him who is light. Light hath no fellowship with darkness. Goodness hath no fellowship with evil. God hath no fellowship with Satan.

Ver. 7. "But if we walk in the light." This is a very simple statement. What do we mean by walking in the light? "Walking in the light" is here contrasted with "walking in darkness" in the preceding verse. We walk in the light when we live up to our highest convictions of right, and we walk in darkness when we refuse to this, or when we shut our hearts to the truth.

— "Since he is in the light". "Since" rather than "as" - i.e. it gives the reason why we have fellowship with each other. Of course it is the same kind of light. There is but one kind of light, but there are many degrees of that light. We do not walk in the light to the extent that He is in the light. That would make us absolutely in the light, and so there would be no sin in us from which to be cleansed. There is a "walking in the light" before the cleansing is complete - i.e. this is a process of growth. When God said to Solomon, "And if thou wilt walk before me, as David thy father walked, in integrity of heart, and in uprightness, to do according to all that I have com-

surrounded thee, and will keep my statutes and my judgments; then will I establish the throne of thy kingdom upon Israel forever," He simply said to him, "Walk in the light". David's "integrity of heart" consisted in his unvarying loyalty to the true God. The trend of his life was toward God. He sinned but that sin was not the trend of his life. It was a side issue.

— "We have fellowship one with another". He has in this verse the true basis of fellowship set forth. There can possibly be no other than that given here. Walking in the light and having fellowship one with another are synonymous.

— "And the blood of Jesus his Son cleanses us from all sin". This is a correlative statement with - "we have fellowship one with another", and like it, is the result of our walking in the light. Note that it is not "has cleansed" nor "will cleanse", but "cleanses". The verb is in the present tense.

The meaning of the verb is also important. It means "to cleanse" - "to make clean", not by covering up but by removing all impurity. Of disease - e.g. leprosy it means to cleanse by curing. See Matt. 8: 2-4.

Since sin is the disease of the soul the cleansing here has in it the idea of healing.

The "blood of Jesus" is the medium through which the cleansing takes place. As the blood in its circulation in our body cleanses it from impurities and heals its wounds, so the "blood of Jesus" circulating in "His body" cleanses it from impurities, and furnishes the material for building it up. For a fuller treatment of this see under General Discussion "The Blood of Jesus". —

22
— General Discussion. —

1. The Basis of Our Fellowship.

"If we say that we have fellowship with him, and walk in darkness, we lie and do not the truth: But if we walk in the light, since he is in the light we have fellowship one with another." He gave in this brief passage the solution to all the problems that are perplexing the Church today. Fellowship with God is the centre and foundation of the Christian life. The Church has been divided into narrow sects, each claiming that its own devotees are pure and holy while the virtues of all the others are but polished vices. They have made belief in certain dogmas, or the observance of certain forms the basis of fellowship, and would unchristianize and exclude from that fellowship all who do not accept the same. This is unevangelical, unapostolic, and last but not least, unchristian, and it has wrought great injury to the Church. What is the remedy for all of this? It is here: That we not only say that we have fellowship with Him, while in reality we are walking in darkness, and do therefore lie and do

not the truth; but that we really and truly "walk
in the light". This is a very simple statement, ^{and}
yet its very simplicity may mislead us. We are
apt to read it over very lightly, and regard it
very superficially, so that it loses its force upon
us. Let us look at it anew. What can it mean?
How can I walk in the light? There must be light
in order that I may walk in it. John says, "God
is light". Now, do I have that light revealed to
me? One says, "Yes, we have the Bible". Very good,
but does not the Bible admit of interpretation?
Are there not many things in it that are hard to
understand? Take, for example, this passage that
we are considering. You have your conception of
it and I have mine. Do they agree? If not, who
is right, or is either right? Do I have the means
of knowing which is right, or what the Bible really
taught? He will let the Bible answer. "If any
one wills to do my will, he shall know of the
doctrine, whether it be of God, or whether I
speak of myself." John 7: 17; or as Paul in Phil.
3: 15, 16, after having set forth his own position, says,
"But if in any thing ye think otherwise, God shall
reveal even this unto you, nevertheless (on condi-
tion that) unto what we have already attained, to
walk in the same." Now what do these

Scriptures say to you? To me they say that when I am desirous of doing God's will (and that means doing right always) He will make it clear to me what His will is, and that that revelation will increase in proportion as I advance in the light that I already have. So that when John says, "walk in the light" he means that I shall live up to my highest convictions of right. If I believe a certain thing is right and refuse to do it for any reason whatsoever, I am walking in darkness and not in the light. It also includes a teachable spirit so that I be ready always to receive light and truth from whatever source it may come to me, knowing that all truth and light are from God. This I hold to be the only way to Christian fellowship.

Fellowship means - joint participation - community - communion &c. It must be something that we have in common. Now let us see:

"God is light and in Him is no darkness at all". If I walk in the light I have fellowship with God. If another walks in the light, he too has fellowship with God, and we must necessarily have fellowship one with the other,

for we are alike (hence companionable) to the extent that we have the same degree of light. There is but one kind of light; but it differs in degree with different persons. The least degree that we may have and still have fellowship is that we purport to do right. If two persons have this desire they have that much in common, though they may differ in everything else. As we advance toward God we have more in common, and so our fellowship is deeper and purer. But unless there is something in common between men there is no power in ecclesiasticism that can make them companionable.

2. The Blood of Jesus. —

"And the blood of Jesus, His Son, cleanses us from all sin." This passage of Scripture needs to be studied again. It has been perverted, and by reading into it the heathen idea of "appeasing the wrath of God" the theology of almost the entire Christian world has been corrupted. This is the result of a superficial reading and a literal interpretation. Dr Lange's Commentary in his notes on this passage he says it means, "the blood shed on the cross, the bloody death of Jesus on the cross", and quotes Wordsworth saying, "No less a sacrifice than the death of the Son of God was required to propitiate the offended justice of God for sin; and no less a price than His blood, to ransom us from the bondage of Satan, to which we were reduced by sin." How can any intelligent being who has carefully studied the character of God as He is revealed to us in Christ say such blasphemous things! What kind of a being is God if this language is true! But it is not true. We are too apt to jump at conclusions in our study of the Bible, regardless of the logical consequences of the conclusions. We must learn not

to interpret any passage of Scripture so as to contradict the revealed character of God.

We are ready then to inquire what this sentence can mean. Of course as far as words and their meanings are concerned it can mean the physical blood of Jesus which He shed on the cross, but then we have to ask how this can "cleanse us from all sin?"

There must be some way in which the blood of Jesus comes in contact with sin. In Heb. 10:22 we have the phrase, "Having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience." Now is there any possible way by which the physical blood of Jesus can be applied to our conscience? It is absurd to talk about it. Then we will have to seek some other explanation.

Many words in the New Testament have a meaning beyond the material:-

1. σαρκ- literally means flesh as distinguished (a). from blood. "Flesh and blood (σαρξ καὶ αἷμα) hath not revealed it unto you." Matt. 16:17, (b). from bones. "Handle me and see that a spirit does not have flesh and bones (σαρὶς καὶ ὀστέα) as ye see me have." Lu. 24:39.

~ σαρκ also has an ethical meaning - a designation of the tendency to lead a sinful life. "Thou hast given him favor over all flesh (σαρκός)." Jos. 17:2; and, "There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh (κατὰ σάρκα).

but after the spirit"; and "for they that are after the flesh (κατὰ σάρκα) do mind the things of the flesh (τὰ τῆς σαρκός)." Rom. 8: 2, 5. *cc. cc.*

— *σὰρξ* also has a still different and higher meaning in Jesus' words to His disciples in Jno. 6: 48-59. "And the bread that I will give is my flesh (τὴν σὰρξ μου ἑορτί)", and "except ye eat the flesh (τὴν σάρκα) of the Son of man, and drink His blood, ye do not have life in yourselves." *cc. cc.*

2. *σῶμα* literally means the fleshly bodily organism. It is better for thee that one of thy members should perish, and not thy whole body (τὸ σῶμά σου) be cast into hell. Matt. 5: 29, 30; and, "the light of the body (τὸ σῶμα) is the eye." Matt. 6: 22. *cc. cc.*

— *σῶμα* also has a higher, spiritual meaning:— At the last Supper with His disciples, Jesus took bread, and when He had given thanks, He brake it and gave it to His disciples saying, "This is my body (τὸ σῶμά μου)" Matt. 26: 26; Luke 22: 19; I Cor. 11: 24. Paul speaks of the Church as "the body" (τὸ σῶμα) of Christ. I Cor. 12: 12, 13, 27; Eph. 1: 22, 23; 4: 12. *cc. cc.* And Paul also says, "There is a soully body (σῶμα ψυχικόν) and there is a spiritual (πνευματικόν) I Cor. 13: 44.

3. *ἄπρος* literally means bread. "If thou be the Son of God command that these stones become

to interpret any passage of Scripture so as to contradict the revealed character of God.

We are ready then to inquire what this sentence can mean. Of course as far as words and their meanings are concerned it can mean the physical blood of Jesus which He shed on the cross, but then we have to ask how this can "cleanse us from all sin?"

There must be some way in which the blood of Jesus comes in contact with sin. In Heb. 10:22 we have the phrase, "Having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience." Now is there any possible way by which the physical blood of Jesus can be applied to our consciences? It is absurd to talk about it. Then we will have to seek some other explanation.

Many words in the New Testament have a meaning beyond the material:-

1. σαρκ- literally means flesh as distinguished (a) from blood. "Flesh and blood (σαρξ καὶ αἷμα) hath not revealed it unto you." Matt. 16:17, (b). from bones. "Handle me and see that a spirit does not have flesh and bones (σὰρκα καὶ ὀστέα) as ye see me have." Lu. 24:39.

~ σαρκ also has an ethical meaning - a designation of the tendency to lead a sinful life. "Thou hast given him power over all flesh (σαρκός)." Jno. 17:2; and, "There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh (κατὰ σάρκα).

but after the spirit"; and, "for they that are after the flesh (κατὰ σὰρκα) do mind the things of the flesh (τὰ τῆς σαρκός)." Rom 8: 2, 5. vc. vc.

— σὰρξ also has a still different and higher meaning in Jesus' words to His disciples in Jno. 6: 48-59. "And the bread that I will give is my flesh (τὴν σὰρξ μου ἑορτίῃ)", and, "except ye eat the flesh (τὴν σὰρκα) of the Son of man, and drink His blood, ye do not have life in yourselves." vc. vc.

2. σῶμα literally means the fleshly bodily organism. It is better for thee that one of thy members should perish, and not thy whole body (τὸ σῶμά σου) be cast into hell". Matt. 5: 29, 30; and, "the light of the body (τὸ σῶμα) is the eye." Matt. 6: 22. vc. vc.

— σῶμα also has a higher, spiritual meaning:— At the last Supper with His disciples, Jesus took bread, and when He had given thanks, He brake it and gave it to His disciples saying, "This is my body (τὸ σῶμά μου)" Matt. 26: 26; Luke 22: 19; I Cor. 11: 24. Paul speaks of the Church as "the body" (τὸ σῶμα) of Christ. I Cor. 12: 12, 13, 27; Eph. 1: 22, 23; 4: 12. vc. vc. And Paul also says, "There is a soully body (σῶμα ψυχικόν) and there is a spiritual (πνευματικόν) I Cor. 15: 44.

3. ἄπρος literally means bread. "If thou be the Son of God command that these stones become

bread (ἄρτος), and "man shall not live by bread (ἵπ' ἄρτου) only". Matt. 4: 3, 4. But Jesus in John 6: 31-59 calls himself "the bread of life" (ὁ ἄρτος τῆς ζωῆς).

4. ὕδωρ literally means water, but there is also a higher, spiritual meaning given to it. See John 4: 1-14.

5. πνεῦμα literally means mind. "The mind bloweth when it wills" (τὸ πνεῦμα ὅπου θέλει πνέει). John 3: 8. Also, "He one making the winds his messengers" (ὁ ποιῶν τοὺς ἀγγέλους αὐτοῦ πνεύματα) (Heb. 1: 3). But in such passages as, Matt. 1: 18; 3: 11; 4: 1; 12: 31; John 14: 26; 15: 26; 16: 7-14 &c. &c. it cannot be translated - mind - but must be translated - Spirit - Holy Spirit - for it is clearly spoken of as a living personality.

Why then may not αἷμα have a meaning beyond the material? Why should we always think of the physical blood when this word is used? There is just as much reason for always translating πνεῦμα - mind - Holy mind - as to always translate αἷμα the literal, animal blood. It seems never to have occurred to any one till recently that it could have any other meaning. Let us see.

"For the life (ψυχὴ) of all flesh is its blood (αἷμα) [Heb. for the life (נַפְשׁוֹ) of the flesh is in the blood] and I have given it to you upon the altar to make an atonement for (ὑπὲρ) your souls: for it is the blood (αἷμα) that maketh an atonement for (ἀντί)

the soul." "For the life ($\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$ - $\psi\chi\eta$) of all flesh is its blood ($\alpha\iota\mu\alpha$ - $\iota\sigma\chi$)" Lev. 17:11-14. The physical blood is the source of the physical life. The source of the spiritual life is not the physical blood but the spiritual blood. "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood ($\alpha\iota\mu\alpha$ $\tau\omicron$ $\alpha\iota\mu\alpha$) ye do not have life in yourselves"; "For my flesh is meat indeed and my blood ($\tau\omicron$ $\alpha\iota\mu\alpha$ $\nu\omicron\upsilon$) is drink indeed." Jno. 6:53, 55. "For by one spirit ($\epsilon\grave{\iota}\varsigma$ $\epsilon\grave{\iota}\varsigma$ $\pi\alpha\upsilon\epsilon\iota\mu\alpha\tau\iota$) are we all baptized into one body, *** and have all been made to drink one spirit ($\epsilon\grave{\iota}\varsigma$ $\pi\alpha\upsilon\epsilon\iota\mu\alpha$." I Cor. 12:13. From that Scriptures it is very evident that both Jesus and Paul had the same thing in mind, and that it was something more than physical blood. And I believe that John had the same thing in mind when he wrote this passage that we are considering.

The physical blood purifies our body. Through it the healing process is carried on. Members may be grafted on, and by means of the circulating medium they are kept alive and grow. "Now ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular," I Cor. 12:27. etc. What is our life? What is the circulating medium (blood) of this body?

That which is attributed to the blood is also attributed to the Holy Spirit. "For the life of all flesh is its blood." Lev. 17:11-14. "It is the spirit that quickeneth (ζωοποιεῖ)" Jns. 6:63. "The letter killeth, but the spirit makes alive (τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ζωοποιεῖ)" II Cor. 3:6. "The blood of Jesus his Son cleanses us from all sin" I Jns. 1:7. "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by (διὰ) a regenerating and renewing bath of the Holy Spirit, which he poured out upon us richly through Jesus Christ our Saviour".

Titus 3:5,6. So why may we not conclude that the Holy Spirit is the living blood of the spiritual body? He comes into "the body of Christ", and through the regenerating and sanctifying influence of the Holy Spirit we are cleansed. There is no life outside of Him. We must abide in Him as the branch in the vine, and then His life becomes our life.

We have a right to ask why John did not say Holy Spirit here instead of "blood" (αἷμα)? I would answer by saying that the figure used is by far more suggestive than if he had said the "Holy Spirit". He had in mind the fact that we are "the body of Christ", and he was writing to Christians who were supposed to understand that, as that αἷμα used in reference to this is very suggestive. If a man does not believe that he is in "the body of Christ"

you cannot explain this to him, or convince
 him that there is a spiritual blood. To me
 this is plain and reasonable as compared to
 the monstrous doctrine that the animal blood
 of Jesus which was shed on the cross, has
 some effect upon God - appeasing His wrath and
 causing Him to shut His eyes ^{up to} sin, and
 say that a man is not a sinner when He
 knows that he is. He must not forget that
 this passage says "cleanses" and not "overlooks".
 He cannot twist it to say anything else. It
 is a thorough cleansing, and nothing less will
 satisfy it. —

— Cap. 1: 8-10. —

8. Ἐὰν εἰπωμεν ὅτι ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ ἔχομεν, ἑαυτοὺς πλανῶμεν καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν ὑμῖν. 9. Ἐὰν ὁμολογῶμεν τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν, πιστὸς ἔστιν καὶ δίκαιος, ἵνα ἁφῇ ἡμῖν τὰς ἁμαρτίας καὶ καθαρῶσιν ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ πάσης ἀδικίας. 10. Ἐὰν εἰπωμεν ὅτι οὐχ ἡμαρτήκαμεν, ψεύστην ποιοῦμεν αὐτόν, καὶ ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν ἡμῖν.

— Parallel Passages. —

1st Epistle.

Gospel.

10. ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν ἡμῖν. 3:38. τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἔχετε ἐν ὑμῖν μένοντα.

+ Grammatical and Lexical. +

Ver. 8. ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ ἔχομεν in this verse is contrasted with οὐχ ἡμαρτήκαμεν in ver. 10. The former denotes a state or condition, while the latter denotes activity. The latter is the stronger expression.

— ἑαυτοὺς πλανῶμεν —. πλανῶμεν is in the active voice rather than the passive and so emphasizes the self-activity, and gives more prominence to the guilt in oneself.

This verb is parallel to ψευδόμεθα in v. 6.

— καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν ὑμῖν — is parallel to καὶ οὐ ποιοῦμεν τὴν ἀλήθειαν in v. 6.

Ver. 9. ὁμολογῶμεν. from ὁμολ and λέγω and therefore means—

"to say the same thing" (as another) - "to agree with."
 ~ πιστός - δίκαιος. These adjectives refer to Jesus rather than to God.

πιστός - "faithful," and is applied to persons who have shown themselves faithful in the discharge of duties. As applied to Jesus here it means that He has proven His fidelity.

Δίκαιος = righteous - right - fit. &c. Right and fitness are synonymous - e.g. the right tool is the one that is fitted to do the work required - the right book is the proper or fit book. &c. &c. 'Serviceable' is the fundamental idea of the word. So we may translate - "He is faithful (i.e. He has proven himself so during His earth-life) and is fitted (or has the right) ἵνα ἀφῇ ἡμῖν τὰς ἀμαρτίας καὶ καταρίῃ ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ πάντων ἀδικιών."

~ ἵνα - "in order to" - i.e. He has the fitness which enables Him "to put away our sin" &c.

~ ἀφῇ ἡμῖν τὰς ἀμαρτίας and καταρίῃ ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ πάντων ἀδικιών are parallel expressions. And used together they express the thoroughness of the work done. ἀμαρτία & ἀδικία mean the same thing.

See Cap. 3:17. ἡ ὅλη ἀδικία ἀμαρτία ἐστίν.

Ver. 10. ἡμαρτήκαμεν. See in Verse 6.

~ ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἐστίν ἐν ἡμῖν is parallel to ἡ ἀλήθεια.

- α οὐκ ἐστίν ἐν ἡμῖν in v. 8. and το οὐ ποιοῦμεν τὴν ἀλήθειαν in v. 6.

- Exegetical. -

Ver. 8. "If we say that we have no sin". There evidently were some who were saying this, and John wanted to correct the error. He does not mean by this that we are "walking in darkness", but that we are not yet free from the power and consequences of sin. Neither does he say here or elsewhere that it is not possible to reach a condition of absolute freedom from sin. On the other hand he does teach us that there must come a time when we will not have sin. If we have turned from our sin - or have come out of darkness into the light, we are no longer in sin, but we still have sin in us. If we are "walking in the light", the "blood of Jesus is cleansing us from sin". It is not yet an accomplished fact, and the degree of the cleansing differs in proportion to the degree that we walk in the light. John recognizes that this is a process of growth, and we will have sin in us until we are in complete harmony with God's will.

- "He deceiveth himself". Self-deception is very common. We can so easily be mistaken about ourselves. Pride is at the bottom of this - self-esteem, and that leads to blindness and deception, and as instead of being freed from sin we are led farther into it. We must turn away from self to God, and then our language will be, "God be merciful to me a sinner" rather than "I have no sin".

— "And the truth is not in us". This is a stronger expression than - "we do not ~~the~~ truth" in v. 6. That refers to its manifestation to others, which might be done in a formal way - "having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof;" this refers to the existence of the divine truth as the principle of life within us. There is that in us that impels us to the truth else we could not receive it.

Ver. 9. "If we confess our sins". We must look upon sin as God does and say the same things about it that He does, and so judge ourselves. We are not to try to make sin look less. How does He regard sin? His standard must be ours. This is absolutely essential in order that we may be freed from sin. The language of our heart must be, "God, I am guilty before Thee, cleanse Thou me and make me pure". God knows this and we can't deceive Him.

— "He is faithful and fitted (or has the right)"
These adjectives point to the character of Jesus. Can we imagine John saying that Jesus will be "faithful and just"? Could He be otherwise. He is talking here about rights which He has, and which He has acquired. He is showing that He who is to cleanse us from all sin

is one who is fitted to do that. He did not have this fitness before He "was made perfect through suffering." Heb. 2:10.

Jesus is faithful. He proved His fidelity in His earth-life - faithful even unto death. And He stands as the first example of completed faith. Because of this fidelity He is fitted to put away our sins, He saved himself and He can save us.

This passage does not mean what it has been said to mean; that God faithful and just when He punishes those who walk in darkness, and blesses those who walk in the light. He rather punishes those who walk in the darkness, and blesses those who walk in the light because He is righteous. We cannot imagine God being anything else but righteousness and justice.

Then again it has been said that He can forgive (overlook) our sins, and still be just because of the sacrifice of Christ. Such a doctrine is horrible and not at all in harmony with God's character of love as revealed to us in Jesus.

"in order that He may put away our sins and cleanse us from all unrighteousness". His character is fitted for the work He has to do. How does He do this? He said in v. 7, "if we walk in the light, since He is in the light we have fellowship one with another,

And the blood of Jesus His Son cleanses us from all sin". What is said here must be in harmony with that. We must be "in Christ" so that His blood (the Holy Spirit) can cleanse us. How thorough is this cleansing to be? It must be absolutely. We have not yet reached that condition, so that we cannot say, "I have no sin". This passage also speaks of "putting away" and "cleansing", and cannot be made to say "overlook" or "disregard". If we will study these passages as we ought we will get much help on "The Forgiveness of Sin".

For a fuller discussion of this see under General Discussion, on "Sin and Its Forgiveness".
Ver. 10. "If we say that we have not sinned".

This teaches us that we are not only to confess that there is yet sin within us, but also to confess that we have actually sinned. It represents an active state while "we have no sin" represents the passive condition. Paul says, "all have sinned and come short of the glory of God." Rom. 3:23. —

— "He make him a liar". Jesus came to save His people from their sins; and if we say that we have not sinned and "do not have sin", we make Him a liar. He came to save us, but we say we don't need to be

saved. Someone is mistaken. Who is it? I rather think with John that "we deceive ourselves" if we say that we do not have sin. Jesus would not have come and have done all that He has done if we had not needed His help. Therefore let us confess our sins and let Him help us to get rid of them.

— "And his word is not in us". A man who is not conscious of sin still in him, is not conscious of the true nature of God's purpose when "He chose us out in Him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before Him in love" (Eph. 1:4); he has not yet reached the condition that Paul had when he cried out. "Oh wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me from this body of death?" See Rom. 7:7-25.

Such men may remember the word of God; they may learn it by heart, but that word is not in them the principle of life by which they are daily and hourly guided; it has not yet entered into their heart. —

General Discussions. -#

— Sin and Its Forgiveness. —

In order that we may understand forgiveness it is absolutely essential that we understand what sin is. The removal of anything depends altogether on what it is. The greater it is the more time and energy it takes to remove it. If sin is only a slight matter, forgiveness likewise is of no great consequence; but if sin is something of vast proportions, then its removal means much more. The following are the principal views of sin that have been promulgated:

1. If we accept the doctrine of Pelagius that sin and virtue are just the overt acts, then forgiveness can mean only the removing of the penalty, or a wiping out of the account. This makes God too formal - a taskmaster with a rod in his hand. And yet this is the view of sin held by a large part of the people of today. This is the only view of sin that is possible as long as they hold to the doctrine of the vicarious sacrifice of Jesus. This view of sin was taken to refute the doctrine of "Total Depravity". The

one is no bad as the other.

2. If we accept the doctrine that sin is simply a lack of development - a lack connected with immaturity - e.g. a green apple is not good because it is not matured, still sin is of no consequence, and needs nothing but time to remove it. This view denies the need of a Saviour at all, and they who hold it are guilty of 'making Him a liar.'

3. But if we accept the Bible doctrine that sin is a disorder of the soul, produced by a lack of conformity to God's will, then the removal of it means the healing of the disease, and bringing the will into complete harmony with the Divine Will.

John in cap. 3:4 of this Epistle says. ἡ ἀνομία ἐστὶν ἡ ἀνομία. 'sin is lawlessness'. This is translated in K. J. 'sin is the transgression of the law'. ἀνομία does not mean 'transgression of law', but 'lawlessness' - 'without law'. Compare. διὰ τὴν παραβάσιν τοῦ νόμου in Rom. 2:23. (For a fuller treatment of ἀνομία see notes on cap. 3:4.).

Sin is the result of development away from God toward self, or in a word it is selfishness. The 'overt act' is only the fruit of the condition of the soul. 'Out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh. A good man out of the good treasure of the heart

bringeth forth good things: and an evil man out of the evil treasure bringeth forth evil things." Matt. 12: 34, 35. "Now the works (fruit) of the flesh are manifest, which are: adultery, fornication, uncleanness &c. &c. But the fruit of the spirit is love, joy, peace &c. &c." Gal. 5: 19-23. These are but the manifestations of certain conditions of soul. For a proof of this let us notice the Saviour's explanation of it in the Sermon on the Mount. Matt. 5: 21-48. The Ancients made murder the overt act of killing, Jesus makes the seat of it in anger; the Ancients made adultery the overt act, Jesus makes it in lust; the Ancients made virtue - not doing wrong to any one, Jesus makes it - loving and doing good to all, even to our enemies &c. &c.

Paul also placed sin in the heart when he says, "I had not known sin, but by the law: for I had not known lust except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet." Rom. 7: 7. Paul did not mean by this that he would not have known anything about wrong doing and its necessary results, but by the law; but that the law revealed to him what he had not yet learned of the sinfulness of sin. The law does not begin with, "Thou shalt not covet,"

but it ends with that, showing that sin is in the desire. The Commands, "Thou shalt not kill", and "Thou shalt not steal", do not reveal sin to us as does "Thou shalt not covet". We would know that it is wrong to kill even if the law did not say so, but we could not know this so well.

Now if sin is a disease of the soul the remedy must be applied to the disease, and forgiveness means - a putting away of sin from the soul, and thoroughly cleansing it from all impurity. As John says, "If we walk in the light, since he is in the light we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus his Son cleansed us from all sin"; and "If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just (or has the right) to put away our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness."

It is unfortunate that our translators did not always translate ἀφίεναι - "put away" - "remove" - instead of "forgive". There would then not be as much trouble to explain this. There is another word in the New Testament that is translated "forgive", and it conveys the exact idea that we always put into the English word, forgive. That word is χαρίζομαι and its modifications. It means - "to show grace to" - "to grant favor to" - "to have charity to".

This verb is used twenty-three times in the New Testament, but it is only twelve times translated "forgive".

The eleven times where it is not translated "forgive" in the Revised Version are: Luke 7:21; Acts. 3:14; 25:11, 16; 27:24; Rom. 8:32; I Cor. 2:12; Gal. 3:18; Phil. 1:29; 2:9; Philemon 22. Let us note its use in the twelve instances where it is translated "forgive":—

"A certain lender had two debtors; the one owed him five hundred pence, and the other fifty. When they had nothing wherewith to pay, he forgave (ἐξαπίωσε) both. Which of them therefore will love him most? Simon answered and said, He, I suppose, to whom he forgave (ἐξαπίωσε) the most." Luke 7:41-43.

"For what is there wherein ye were made inferior to the rest of the Church, except it be that I myself was not burdensome to you? Forgive me (χαρίσασθε μοι) this wrong." II Cor. 12:13.

"Sufficient to such an one is the punishment which was inflicted by the many; so that contrariwise ye should rather forgive (χαρίσασθαι) him and comfort him, lest by any means such an one should be swallowed up with overmuch sorrow." II Cor. 2:6, 7.

"But to whom ye forgive (χαρίζεσθε) anything, I also; for what I also have forgiven (κεχαρίσμαι) anything, it is for your sakes." II Cor. 2:10.

"And you being dead through your transgressions

and the uncircumcision of your flesh, you did be quicken together with him having forgiven (Χαρισάμενος) us all our trespasses." Col. 2:13. Note in this that favor was shown in order that He might make us alive, and had it not been we could not have been made alive. The main verb in this passage is σὺνζωοποιήσας.

"Put on therefore, as God's elect, holy and beloved, a heart of compassion, kindness, humility, meekness, long-suffering; forbearing one another, and forgiving (Χαρίζεσθαι) one another, if any man have a complaint against any; even as Christ forgave (ἐχαρίσατο) you, so also do ye" Col. 3:12, 13.

"Let all bitterness, and wrath, and anger, and clamor, and railing, be put away from you, with all malice; and be ye kind one to another, tender-hearted, forgiving (Χαρίζεσθαι) each other even as God also in Christ forgave (ἐχαρίσατο) you." Eph. 4:31, 32.

Now let us compare some of the uses of ἀφίημι and see the difference.

"And forgive (ἀφίημι) us our debts as we forgive (ἀφίηκαμεν) our debtors." Matt. 6:12.

For if ye forgive (ἀφίητε) men their trespasses your heavenly Father will also forgive (ἀφίησιν) you." Matt. 6:14. cf. v. 15. This word means more than

426
having charity toward. It means an actual removal of the wrong. We must help the man to get rid of that condition of heart that made him do a wrong to us. This is what God is doing for us. In order to do this we must have to have charity or grace toward the man, even as God does for us.

"And Jesus, seeing their faith, said unto the sick of the palsy, Son, be of good cheer; thy sins are being forgiven ($\alpha\phi\epsilon\iota\upsilon\tau\alpha\iota$)." Matt. 9:2. See vs. 546. Also Mark 2:5:9; Luke 5:20, 23.

"All manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven ($\alpha\phi\epsilon\theta\eta\sigma\iota\tau\alpha\iota$) unto men - &c." Matt. 12:31, 32.

Then came Peter to him and said, Lord, how often shall my brother sin against me and I forgive ($\alpha\phi\eta\omega$) him?" Matt. 18:21.

"That seeing they may see, and not perceive; and hearing they may hear and not understand; lest at any time they should turn and it be forgiven ($\alpha\phi\epsilon\theta\eta$) to them." Mark 4:12. cf. Matt. 13:14, 15; "and I should heal ($\iota\alpha\sigma\sigma\alpha\iota$) them". In Matt. we have a quotation from Isa. 6:9, 10. But Jesus in Mark 4:12 interprets $\iota\alpha\sigma\sigma\alpha\iota$ by $\alpha\phi\epsilon\theta\eta$. This is significant.

"Wherefore I say unto thee, her sins which are many are forgiven ($\alpha\phi\epsilon\iota\omega\tau\alpha\iota$) her,

47

because she loved much; to whom little is forgiven ($\alpha\phi\iota\epsilon\rho\alpha\iota$) he loveth little. And he said to her thy sins are forgiven ($\alpha\phi\epsilon\iota\omega\rho\alpha\iota$). "Luke 7: 47, 48. cf. these two verses with their use of $\alpha\phi\iota\mu\epsilon\iota$ with the use of $\chi\alpha\rho\iota\varsigma\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$ in verses 41-43 of this same chapter.

"And Jesus said, Father, forgive ($\alpha\phi\epsilon\iota\varsigma$) them." Luke 23: 34. And He meant much more than that God should close His eyes to their sinful condition, and say they were not sinners. Jesus' real prayer is that God should lead these men to see their real condition, turn from it, and become good men. If He had meant only 'show mercy to' He would have used $\chi\alpha\rho\iota\varsigma\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$.

"Repent therefore from this thy wickedness, and pray the Lord, if perchance the thought of thy heart may be forgiven ($\alpha\phi\epsilon\theta\eta\sigma\iota\gamma\alpha\iota$) thee." Acts 8: 22.

"And if he hath committed sins they shall be forgiven ($\alpha\phi\epsilon\theta\eta\sigma\iota\gamma\alpha\iota$) him." James 5: 15.

"If we confess our sins, he is faithful and fitted (or has the right) to forgive ($\alpha\phi\eta$) us our sins and to cleanse ($\kappa\alpha\theta\alpha\rho\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\iota$) us from all unrighteousness." I. Jno. 1: 9.

From these scriptures, and from many others that might be added it is plain that when sins are spoken of as being "forgiven" it means much more than being "charitable towards", or a pro-

-nouncing the guilty one "not guilty". It means the complete removal of all sin and its results from the soul - a thorough cleansing of the soul and filling it with new life - the cure of the soul. Of course in all of these passages is presupposed the grace of God, else He could never bring us into salvation. But let us not mistake the grace thus shown, for the real cleansing of the soul that is constantly going on in those who are walking in the light. We must bear in mind also, that sin being in the soul, the forgiveness (taking away) must also take place there. So long as the soul's disorder remains, no pronouncing of sin forgiven can do any good, and it would be a lie, be the pronouncing done by God or man.

The lesson to be learned from all this is that this work cannot be accomplished in a short space of time, but it will take time in proportion to the magnitude of the work. Surely we must feel like Paul and exclaim, "Who is sufficient for these things?" No one but an Almighty God is able to do such a work. He has all the means in the universe at His disposal, and He is using them con-

staunchly to bring us back to Him. He has many means of grace which, if we would but use, we would make more rapid progress in the process of our purification. Shall He fail in this work? Then would sin be more powerful than good. No. He cannot fail, but will accomplish that which He desires - viz "to bring together in one all things in Christ, both which are in the heavens and which are on earth, even in Him." Eph. 3:10.

— Cap. 2: 1, 2. —

1. Τεκνία μου, τὰντα γράφω ὑμῖν ἵνα μὴ ἀμάρτητε. καὶ ἐάν τις ἀμάρτη, παράκλητον ἔχουσιν πρὸς τὸν πατέρα, Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν δίκαιον· 2. καὶ αὐτὸς ἰλασμός ἐστιν περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν, οὐ περὶ τῶν ἡμιστῆρων δὲ μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ περὶ ὅλου τοῦ κόσμου.

— Parallel passages. —

1st Epistle.

Gospel.

1. παράκλητον ἔχουσιν.

πρὸς τὸν πατέρα.

2. περὶ ὅλου τοῦ κόσμου.

14:16. ἄλλον παράκλητον δεόμεν ὑμῖν.

1:2. πρὸς τὴν θεόν.

1:29. ὁ αἴρων τὴν ἁμαρτίαν τοῦ κόσμου.

4:42. οὗτός ἐστιν ἀληθὺς

ὁ σωτὴρ τοῦ κόσμου.

11:51, 52. ἐπροφῆτισιν ὅτι ἐμελέεν Ἰησοῦς ἀποθνήσκειν ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἔθνους, καὶ οὐχ ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἔθνους μόνον, ἀλλ' ἵνα καὶ τὰ τέκνα τοῦ θεοῦ τὰ διεσκηρτισμένα συναγάγῃ εἰς ἑν.

— Grammatical and Lexical. —

Ver. 1. *Τεκνία* = the diminutive of *τέκνα* and is a tender and affectionate appellation. In the New Testament this word is always used in the plural.

— *ταῦτα γράφω*. We have here John's first use of the singular - "I write". cf. Cap. 1:1-4. "We write".

— *ἵνα μὴ ἀμαρτῆτε*. denotes his purpose in writing.

— *παράκλητον*. The article is not used with this word here. cf. Jno. 14:16. ἄλλον παράκλητον. Why should this word be translated "advocate" here, and in Jno. 14:16 be translated "Comforter"?

παράκληω = "called to one's side". Hence the idea of help. "an helper" - "an assistant".

— *πρὸς τὸν πατέρα*. We have here the same expression as in Cap. 1:2. cf. Jno. 1:1, 2. *πρὸς τὸν θεόν*. It may have: 1. A purely local idea. 2. The idea of "direction towards" - a "longing for" - as suggested in notes on Cap. 1:2. - p. 3. - I prefer the purely local idea here. 1-4. Our Helper is in the very centre of power & love with God.

— *δικαίον*. See notes on Cap. 1:9. - p. 34.

Ver. 2. *καὶ αὐτὸς ἰλασμός ἐστιν*. cf. Cap. 4:10. These are the only two places in the New Testament where this word is used. We have the verb *ἰλάσκειν* used in Luke 18:13. ὁ θεός, ἰλάσθητί μοι τῷ ἁμαρτωλῷ; and in Heb. 2:17. ὁ θεὸς ὥφειλεν κατὰ πάντα τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς δοξοῦσθαι, ἵνα ἐλεήμων γένηται καὶ πιστὸς ἀρχιερεὺς τὰ πρὸς

τὸν θεόν, εἰς τὸ ἰλάσκεσθαι τὰς ἀμαρτίας τοῦ λαοῦ.

And we have ἰλαστήριον used in Rom. 3:25. ὃν προ-
-έθετο ὁ θεὸς ἰλαστήριον διὰ πίστεως, ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ
αἵματι. etc.; and in Heb. 9:5. ὑπεράνω δὲ αὐτῆς κερου-
-βείμ δόξης κατασκιάζοντα τὸ ἰλαστήριον.

See Numb. 5:8. πλὴν τοῦ κριοῦ τοῦ ἱλασμοῦ [Heb. יָצַח
יָצַח], δι' οὗ ἐξιλάσεται (יָצַח) περὶ (יָצַח) αὐτοῦ ἐν
αὐτῷ; And Ezekiel 44:27. προσοίσουσιν ἱλασμόν
(יִסְחָוּ בְּיָדָם); And Exodus 25:17. ἰλαστήριον
translated in K. J. "mercy seat". etc. etc.

— περὶ τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν. If this passage
were to mean what it is said to mean - as
"appeasing God" we would have to have here ἱλα-
-σμός τοῦ θεοῦ; instead of this we have περὶ with
the genitive, and that with ἀμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν and
not with τοῦ θεοῦ. This is significant.

— οὐ περὶ τῶν ἡμετέρων δὲ μόνον etc. Here we
have the same idea. of the parallel passage of
Jno. 11:51, 52. —

52

- Exegetical -

Rev. 1. "My little children". John was the spiritual father of these persons and he had a special interest in their welfare. On this account he writes to them that he may help them.

- "these things I write to you". He has in this chapter a change from the plural "we" to the singular "I". He comes close to them by this personal message.

- "that ye sin not". This is the purpose of his writing. While he had just said, "If we say that we have no sin we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us", and, "If we say that we have not sinned we make him a liar, and his word is not in us", yet the ideal which John holds out before us is a life of sinlessness, and we ought to be striving to live without sinning. By this he means more than Macknight suggests - "either their not sinning habitually, or their not sinning willfully." The time must come when we will live without sin. That time has not yet come to most of us. It is possible for us to live without sinning if we will use the means of help that God has so graciously given to us. This is what John desired in all of them, yet he knew they would sin and so he adds:

- "And if any one does sin we have an Helper with the Father - Jesus Christ the fitted one."

This is translated in H. J. "We have an advocate." The idea that is read into this passage is that we have an advocate (lawyer) who is working to change the decision of the Father in reference to man's guilt. What does not mean by "advocate"? The lawyer has been made an advocate between all professions. "Helper" is the best word used because it does not designate the kind of work that He does. That which He does must be in harmony with His character. Either one of two things is necessary:

1. To try to get God to be pleased with our sin.
2. To get us free from sin.

This letter teaches us to be free from sin, and we have "an Helper" to this end, in the seat of all power, wisdom, and goodness—"with God." He has many helpers here in this world, but how weak they are as compared to Him. He can only help us to do what is right. Would it be right for Him to try to get God to look with pleasure on sin? Does God need to be pleaded with in order that He may do the right thing by us? "Shall not the judge of all the earth do right?" Imagine God as a judge sitting on the bench, and Christ as a lawyer

pleading the case, trying to make the true God give a verdict of "not guilty" on a guilty man, - a man who is known to be guilty by both God and Christ!

A more monstrous thing cannot be imagined! That would be a case of God denying himself, which is impossible. The help is needed on man's part and Jesus certainly is helping us. God cannot accept us in sin, and as nothing is left but that

Jesus is helping us to get free from sin. Jesus is our Helper, and yet He tells us that He will send "another helper". The Scriptures do not separate the Spirit - Jesus and God as we sometimes think. They are all working together for one end - the Salvation of all their creatures. Jesus is fitted and has the right to help us get free from sin. See notes on cap. 1:9.

"What we need to get rid of sin is not a lawyer but a physician". - Peter Vogel. - A lawyer can't help us in this case. Sin is a disease and the disease must be cured by applying the remedy to it, and not by trying to get God to accept us all covered over with sin. Even though God would take us to a city with "golden streets and pearly gates" in that condition we would not and, what is more, we could not be happy. Sin and misery are inseparably connected, and as virtue

and happiness. True happiness in sin is an absolute impossibility.

Ver. 2. "And he is that which is making reparation concerning our sins". The word which is here translated - "that which is making reparation", used here and also in Cap. 4:10, has in it the idea of brightness, hence "remedy" or "reparation" is a good translation of it. It is not the actor - the who - but rather the means - that which. It makes good or repairs the wrong that sin has done, and this, of course, must take place within us.

The heathen idea was that the gods in their normal condition are not favorable to man, hence man has to appease them. We have a reference to this in Jer. 7:2. "When they had sent to the house of the god, Sherezor and Regem the king and his men to entreat the face of the Lord." There can be no question but that the Jews were influenced more or less by this idea; at least we have an intimation of it in I. Sam. 13:11, 12. When Saul feared an attack of the Philistines and he seemed troubled because "he had not entreated the face of the Lord."

What Saul says about this has no influence on us, only to show us his idea of it. There is no intimation in the Bible proper of God being appeased except it be in the case of Moses Ex. 32: 7-14. But this word, 7517 is doubtful in meaning. Perhaps it means 'to smooth the face'.

Nägelsbach says, that the heathens always followed this verb with the Genitive. A heathen would not talk of sin being appeased. They had no such conception. Jesus then is the means through which God is pleased with us - not with us in sin, but through Him we can be freed from sin.

There is no change produced on God. He is unchangeable. All that this passage says is, "you cannot get rid of sin, or be saved, without Jesus." - "And not concerning ours only, but also concerning (those) of the whole world." It is difficult for some men to believe this. 'It is an easy thing for God to be merciful to me and to my friends, but I can't see how He can be to the man I don't like' is the language of the flesh.

— Cap. 2: 3-6. —

3. καὶ ἐν τούτῳ γινώσκουμεν ὅτι ἐγνώκαμεν αὐτόν, ἐὰν τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ τηρῶμεν. 4. ὁ λέγων ὅτι ἐγνώκα αὐτόν, καὶ τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ μὴ τηρῶν, ψεύστης ἐστίν, καὶ ἐν τούτῳ ἡ ἀλήθεια οὐκ ἐστίν. 5. ὁ δὲ δ' ἂν τηρῇ αὐτῷ τὸν λόγον, ἀληθῶς ἐν τούτῳ ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ θεοῦ τετελείωται. ἐν τούτῳ γινώσκουμεν ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ ἐσμέν. 6. ὁ λέγων ἐν αὐτῷ μένειν ὀφείλει καθὼς ἐκεῖνος περιπάτησιν καὶ αὐτὸς οὕτως περιπατεῖν.

— Parallel Passages. —

1st Epistle.

Gospel.

3. ἐὰν τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ τηρῶμεν, ἐγνώκαμεν αὐτόν.

13:10. ἐὰν τὰς ἐντολὰς μου τηρήσῃτε, μένετε ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ μου.

14:21. ὁ ἔχων τὰς ἐντολὰς μου καὶ τηρῶν αὐτάς, ἐκεῖνός ἐστιν ὁ ἀγαπῶν με.

5. ὁ δὲ δ' ἂν τηρῇ αὐτῷ τὸν λόγον.

14:23. ἐὰν τις ἀγαπᾷ με, τὸν λόγον μου τηρήσει.

6. ὁ φείλει καθὼς ἐκεῖνος περιπάτησιν καὶ αὐτὸς οὕτως περιπατεῖν.

13:16. ἵνα καθὼς ἐγὼ ἐποίησα ὑμῖν καὶ ὑμεῖς ποιᾷτε.

Grammatical and Lexical.

- Ver. 3. ἐν τούτοις - refers to what follows - ἐὰν τὰς ἐντολὰς νε.
- ἐγνώκαμεν - perfect. "have known".
 - αὐτόν refers to Jesus.
 - ἐὰν τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ τηρῶμεν. The Cod. Sin. has φυλάξωμεν here instead of τηρῶμεν. John always used τηρέω with ἐντολή - except in cap. 5:2 we have τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ ποιῶμεν, and twice where the verb ἐντέλλω is used, he used the verb ποιέω. See Jno. 14:31; 15:14. τηρέω = "to observe carefully". It has in it the idea of care - and refers particularly to the content of the ἐντολή, while ποιέω means rather to make. It has in it the idea of author. So τηρέω is better. φυλάσσω has nearly the same idea - that of guarding.
- Ver. 4. ὁ δέγων ὅτι ἐγνώκα αὐτόν νε. ψεύστης ἐστίν, καὶ ἐν τούτοις ἡ ἀλήθεια οὐκ ἐστίν.
- ψεύστης ἐστίν is stronger than ψευδόμεθα in cap. 1:6. καὶ ἐν τούτοις ἡ ἀλήθεια οὐκ ἐστίν shows the emptiness of this character.
- Ver. 5. τὸν λόγον = all the expression of God in Jesus.
- αὐτοῦ - note its emphatic position.
 - τετελείωται - "is completed." perfect tense.
 - ἐν τούτοις refers back and is connected with the ἐν τούτοις of v. 3.

— ἐν αὐτῷ ἐοικέν is the same in thought as
τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ τηρῶμεν.

— ἐν αὐτῷ refers to Christ. Of course it can
and does refer to God too - for "all is Christ
and Christ is God's".

Ver 6. ὁ λέγων ἐν αὐτῷ μένειν ὁ φείδει καί.

denotes an obligation. We have indirect dis-
course here and also in v. 9. John usually
has ὅτι in direct discourse. See Cap. 1:6, 8, 10;
2:4; 4:20.

— οὕτως - T: H omit. It is wanting in the A.B.
Vulgate. Its presence makes the thought emphat-
-ic. — 4

- Exegetical. -

Ver. 3. 'And by this we know.' This is not something that is uncertain, but that which may be experienced by each one. There are no uncertainties in John's writings. It was a living reality to him, and it may be to us also.

- "that we have known him". The verb here is perfect "we have known". We know anything only when it has been assimilated by us. The gaining of knowledge is a process of assimilation - a process of growth. If a man is not assimilated to Jesus he does not know Him and how He works in our lives. He may know external facts about Him, but he does not know the inward experiences. After Paul had served Him for years, and had preached Him to many, yet his desire was, "that I may know him and the power of his resurrection and the fellowship of his sufferings, being made conformable unto his death; if by any means I might attain unto the resurrection out of dead." Phil. 3:10, 11.

Jesus is the object of the knowing, but He must become a part of the one knowing. He must realize Him working in us, and feel Him lifting us up day by day. A moral theoret-

ical knowledge will not do here at all. It must be vital. Jesus' life must flow into ours. Then we know Him. To reach this we must travel the same road that He did. He is "the way". This way leads through death - "being made conformable unto his death." "It is a faithful saying that if we die with him we shall also live with him".

— "if we keep his instruction". This is not "commandments" in the sense of a law. It cannot be if Paul was right when he said "We are not under law". One command would be a law. But if we take it as "instruction", then it presents Jesus as the teacher and we His disciples - learners. He is showing us how to do. He is in Him. He also is in us. He lives our life from Him. If we are being assimilated to Him we will keep His instruction. The basis of this relation is love. If we were perfectly assimilated to Him we would keep His instruction perfectly, and if we would follow His instruction perfectly we would soon become assimilated to Him perfectly - i.e. know Him perfectly. This is a wonderful relation.

Ver. 4. "The one saying that I have known him,
and not keeping his instruction, is a liar".

It does not make any difference what our pretensions may be about knowing him, if we fail to keep his instruction it is evidence that we do not know him. This can only be true when we take "the knowing him" to mean our assimilation to him. It is a fact that we all know many persons who have much knowledge in regard to the facts of Jesus' life, and yet they do not keep his teaching. He could not say that this man was a liar if he professed to have this knowledge about Jesus. But if we take it to mean our assimilation to him based on love, and then do not follow his teaching we lie.

— "And in this one the truth is not". This gives emphasis to the fact of his emptiness and hypocrisy.

Ver. 5: "But whoso keepeth of him the word". "The Word" is all the expression of God in Jesus. He is the "Word of God". "Word" and "instruction" are not synonymous in general, yet the "instruction" of Jesus, including both precept and example, include "the Word" as far as it has reference to us at least, that we have Jesus teaching and

doing something not in harmony with His nature, or something not necessary to us. He is "the way" - not in any technical sense, but in reality. His life is the way that will lead us back to God. His life = His instruction. So that it is essential to us that we keep "His word".

— "Truly in this one is the love of God perfected". The "love of God" is objective love. If one did not have love for God, which means the love of God's character, he would not pay any attention to "the word". God is seeking to create in us a love for Him in order that that may lead us to keep His instruction and so come back to Him. The Holy Spirit of course is before all of this. "His love is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Spirit which he has given unto us." Rom. 5:5. The degree of the perfection of the love is in proportion to the keeping of the word and vice versa.

— "By this we know that we are in him". i.e. by keeping "His word". "That we are in him" here takes the place of "that we have known him" in v. 3. and is equivalent to

that expression. It brings out the relationship more closely, and then there is less danger for superficial reading and thinking.

Ver. 6. "The one saying that he remains in him, ought himself also as to walk, as that one walked." Christ showed to the world what He was by His daily walk, and if we are in Him and He in us, we must also show that by our walk. He is "the vine" and we are to remain in Him as the condition of bearing fruit. See Jno. 15:1-10. Of course we are in God too, for Jesus is in harmony with God. What we do not walk as Jesus did was and departing from Him. We can not be in Him and away from Him at the same time. So that if we make a profession of being in Him we are obligated by the very nature of the case to walk just as He walked. This, of course, means that we "walk in the light." —

* General Discussion. *

Ἡ ἙΝΤΟΛΗ. Command or Instruction?

The exact meaning of words plays an important part in exegesis. No express necessity of thought was ever chosen from a variety of so called synonyms. But while we do so we must keep in mind that the precise meaning of these synonyms vary with the age of their use, the kind of discourse employed, and often with the character of the subject matter treated. In the Greek language our word "command" in its several shades of meaning is expressed very concisely. This fact has, it seems, been almost entirely overlooked by commentators on and translators of the New Testament. The aim of this discussion is to show the use of ἑντολή. According to Smith's Greek Synonyms the words meaning "command" in the Greek are κελεύειν, παραγγέλλειν, ἐντέλλεσθαι, τάσσειν and its compounds.

κελεύειν. to command - designates verbal orders emanating from a superior; παραγγέλλειν - to charge - is the order of a military commander, which is passed along the line by

that expression. It brings out the relationship more closely, and then there is less danger for superficial reading and thinking.

Ver. 6. "The one saying that he remains in him, ought likewise also as to walk, as that one walked." Christ showed to the world what He was by His daily walk, and if we are in Him and He in us, we must also show that by our walk. He is "the vine" and we are to remain in Him as the condition of bearing fruit. See Jno. 15:1-10. Of course we are in God too, for Jesus is in harmony with God. Thus we do not walk as Jesus did we are departing from Him. He can not be in Him and away from Him at the same time. So that if we make a profession of being in Him we are obligated by the very nature of the case to walk just as He walked. This, of course, means that we "walk in the light". —

+ General Discussion. +
 Ἡ ἙΝΤΟΛΗ - Command or Instruction?

The exact meaning of words plays an important part in exegesis. No express necessity of thought was ever chosen from a variety of so called synonyms. But while we do so we must keep in mind that the precise meaning of these synonyms vary with the age of their use, the kind of discourse employed, and often with the character of the subject matter treated. In the Greek language our word "command" in its several shades of meaning is expressed very concisely. This fact has, it seems, been almost entirely overlooked by commentators on and translators of the New Testament. The aim of this discussion is to show the use of ἑντολή. According to Smith's Greek Synonyms the words meaning "command" in the Greek are κελεύειν, παραγγέλλειν, ἐντέλλομαι, τάσσειν and its compounds.

κελεύειν - to command - designates verbal orders emanating from a superior; παραγγέλλειν - to charge - is the order of a military commander, which is passed along the line by

his subordinates; ἐντέλλεσθαι - to enjoin - is employed by those whose office or position invests them with claims and rights to the contents of the command like our word "instruct"; τάσσειν - to assign a part to - suggests duties connected with the "post". ἐπιτάσσειν and προτάσσειν differ from ἐντέλλεσθαι in denoting fixed obligations rather than specific instructions.

When we turn to the New Testament we find that these same distinctions are made. Κεκρίναι occurs about twenty-five times, παραγγέλλειν, twenty-seven times, τάσσειν and its compounds, twenty-six times, and ἐντέλλεσθαι, twenty times. I give a few references of the first three simply to show their use.

Κεκρίναι. "Now when Jesus saw great multitudes about him, he commanded (ἐκέκρινεν) to depart unto the other side". Matt. 8:18. "But when they had commanded (κεκρίναντες) them to go aside out of the council, they conferred among themselves". Acts 4:15. παραγγέλλειν. "These twelve Jesus sent forth and commanded (παραγγέλλας) them (changed them) saying" ve. Matt 10:5. "That thou mightest charge (παραγγέλλης) some that they teach no other doctrine". I. Tim. 1:3. ve. ve.

τάσσειν. "Then the eleven disciples went away into Galilee, into a mountain where Jesus had

appointed (ἑτάξατο) them". Matt. 28:16. "When therefore Paul and Barnabas had no small discussion and disputation with them, they assigned (ἑτάσαν) Paul and Barnabas and certain others of them to go up to the apostles and elders at Jerusalem, about this question." cc. Acts 15:2.

Now compare with these a few references showing the use of ἐντέλλομαι. "For God commanded (ἐνετείλατο) saying, Honour thy father and thy mother". Matt. 15:4. "And he commanded (ἐνετείλατο) the porter to watch." Mark 13:34. "But that the world may know that I love the Father; and as the Father gave me commandment (ἐνετείλατο) even as I do." Jno. 14:31. "For as hath the Lord commanded (ἐντέλλομαι) us saying, I have set thee to be a light to the Gentiles, that thou shouldst be for salvation unto the ends of the earth." Acts 13:47.

The noun ἐντολή, derived from the theme of ἐντέλλομαι, occurs more than fifty times, being found in all parts of the New Testament. In some places ἐντολή signifies a command like κέλευμα or ἐντάλμα, but again in many places it

Cannot have such meaning, but should be translated "instruct." This is clear from a careful study of the following passages:

"A new Commandment ($\epsilon\upsilon\lambda\omicron\gamma\epsilon$) I give you, that ye love one another." Jno. 13:34. Is love subject to command? Jno. 15:10, 12. if $\epsilon\upsilon\lambda\omicron\gamma\epsilon$ = Command could the singular and plural be used indifferently? Acts. 17:15. The relation of the participle forbids command. Eph. 2:15 = instruction in the form of commandments. Col. 4:10. The relation of the participle again forbids command. I. Tim. 6:14. If Commandment, which one? I. Cor. 14:37. The Apostle states that he was writing the Lord's instructions - $\epsilon\upsilon\lambda\omicron\gamma\epsilon$ - In II Peter. 3:2 the reader is exhorted "to call to mind the instructions ($\epsilon\upsilon\lambda\omicron\gamma\epsilon$) of us apostles". II. Peter 2:21. Which Commandment? For Rev. 22:14 See Revised Version based on Tischendorf's text. These and other passages that might be added show us clearly that this word was used in the same sense that we use "instruction" and should be so translated.

The Old Testament is a book of commands - thou shalt and thou shalt not - in the doing of which one should live, but the New abounds in instruction. There is a new arrangement and it is a personal one. Our life is in

Christ. He is our Teacher - our Guide. Man is out of touch with Him today, but tomorrow he is drawn by His instruction and regains contact. He is the magnet that draws all to the Father. Liberty is the genius of progress and education. If the new Arrangement contains laws wherein is it better than the Old? Are the laws higher or lower? If they are higher and man could not keep the Old, how can he keep the New? If they are lower, the Old was more perfect than the New, and we are retrograding instead of progressing. Paul says, "We are not under law but under grace"? This does not mean that we are not under the Mosaic law" as some teach, but it means that we are not under any law. How many commands does it take to make a law? Is not one command a law? Was Paul mistaken? Perhaps some may ask the question of old, "shall we sin because we are not under law?" God forbid. He is just as guilty who disregards instruction - or more so - than he who breaks a law. He violates a higher relation.

When we think of the relation of Jesus

to us - as Teacher - we the learners - it is a holier relation than it otherwise could be. He tells us all because we are no longer "servants" but "friends" - i.e. from His standpoint, from ours however, after we have done all, we shall still say, "I am an unprofitable servant". Oh how much we need teaching! So many dark, perplexing questions confront us every day! Jesus will lead us into the truth. Let us henceforth study the Bible as our guide book to truth - in it He is teaching us how to live - and it will become a new book to us. —

— Cap. 2: 7-11. —

7. Ἀγαπητοί, οὐκ ἐντολὴν καινὴν γράφω ὑμῖν, ἀλλ' ἐντολὴν παλαι-
 ᾶν, ἣν εἴχετε ἀπ' ἀρχῆς· ἡ ἐντολὴ ἡ παλαιά ἐστίν ὁ λόγος ὃν ἤκού-
 σατε. 8. πάλιν ἐντολὴν καινὴν γράφω ὑμῖν, ὃ ἐστὶν ἀληθὺς ἐν
 αὐτῷ καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν, ὅτι ἡ σκοτία παράγεται καὶ τὸ φῶς τὸ ἀληθινὸν
 ἤδη φαίνει. 9. ὁ λέγων ἐν τῷ φωτὶ εἶναι καὶ τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ μισ-
 ῶν ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ ἐστὶν ἕως ἄρτι. 10. ὁ ἀγαπῶν τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐ-
 τοῦ ἐν τῷ φωτὶ μένει, καὶ σκάνδαλον οὐκ ἐστὶν ἐν αὐτῷ. 11.
 ὁ δὲ μισῶν τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ ἐστὶν καὶ ἐν τῇ
 σκοτίᾳ περιπατεῖ, καὶ οὐκ οἶδεν πῶς ὑπάγει, ὅτι ἡ σκοτία
 ἐτύφλωσεν τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ.

— Parallel Passages. —

1st Epistle.

Corinth.

8. ἐντολὴν καινὴν γράφω ὑμῖν.

13:34. ἐντολὴν καινὴν δίδωμι
 ὑμῖν.

8. τὸ φῶς τὸ ἀληθινὸν ἤδη φαίνει.

1:5. τὸ φῶς ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ φαίνει.

11. ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ περιπατεῖ, καὶ

11:10. ἐὰν οἷ τις περιπατῇ ἐν τῇ

οὐκ οἶδεν πῶς ὑπάγει, ὅτι ἡ

νυκτὶς προσκόπτει, ὅτι τὸ φῶς

σκοτία ἐτύφλωσεν τοὺς ὀφθαλ-

μοὺς αὐτοῦ.

μοὺς αὐτοῦ.

12:35. περιπατεῖτε ὡς τὸ φῶς ἔχει,

ἵνα μὴ σκοτία ὑμᾶς καταλάβῃ· καὶ

ὁ περιπατῶν ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ οὐκ οἶδεν

πῶς ὑπάγει.

— Grammatical and Lexical. —

Ver. 7. Ἀγαπῶντες. So in Caps. 2:2, 21; 4:1, 7, 11. "Beloved" - an epithet of tender address. cf. this use of τεκνίασθαι in v. 1.

— ἐντολή must mean "instruction" here. ἡ ἐντολὴ ἡ παλαιά is ὁ λόγος.

— Some texts insert ἀπ' ἀρχῆς at the close of the verse but the best authorities omit it.

— ὅς. Here John uses the masculine with λόγος instead of the Neuter as in Cap. 1:1.

Ver. 8. καὶ ἄλλω - on the other hand - again - belongs to γράφω.

— ὅ refers, not to ἐντολὴν, for that is feminine, but to the contents of the ἐντολὴν καὶ ἄλλω. "which (thing) is true &c."

— ἐμὴν. He would rather expect ἡμῶν here, and some texts have it, but it has less authority than ἐμὴν. He would expect John to include himself in this.

— ὅτι. a particle used merely to introduce the content of the ἐντολὴν καὶ ἄλλω, equivalent to our Viz. "that" or "namely". Some make it causal here but there is no ground for it.

— παράγειται - present tense - "is passing away".

— φαίνει - also present - "is shining".

— ἤδη - "already" and not "now" as in K. J.

The Vulgate falsely renders ἡ σκοτία παράγειται - tenebrae transierunt. And Luther translated it - die Finsterniss ist vergangen. The present should by all means be retained. This is a continuous

process and that is commonly expressed by the present tense.

Ver. 9. ὁ λόγος - See Vs. 4, 6.

Ver. 10. ἄγαθόν is connected with φῶς as κλονεῖν is with σκοτία.

— σκάνδαλον = a purely Biblical word - occurring some twenty-five times in the Greek O. T. and fifteen - quotations included - in the N. T. It is the LXX for ὑπὸ (a noose - a snare) and σιῶσα. It properly means a "trap" or "snare" - any impediment placed in the way causing one to stumble - hence "stumbling block". Our word "scandal" is a transliteration of the Greek.

Ver. 11. ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ ἔστιν is strengthened by the additional clauses - καὶ ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ περιπατεῖ, and οὐκ οἶδεν ποῦ ὁπάσει.

— ὅτι - Here is causal - "because".

* Exegetical. *

Ver. 7. "Beloved." John began this chapter with "my little children", and now he calls them "Beloved".

He is very tender toward them. He has the same interest in them that a father has in his child.

— "I do not write to you new instruction". This cannot be "commandment" here. There is no sign of a commandment in this Epistle, but it abounds in much beautiful instruction. That which he writes is not new in that he has added any outward teaching to what he had written in the Gospel, or to what he had preached to them.

— "But old instruction, which ye had from the beginning." All of the facts about Jesus's life had been given to them, so that as regards history there was nothing more to give.

— "The old instruction is the Logos (Word) whom ye have heard". The Logos cannot be commandment in the sense of law, but ~~he~~ is the embodiment of God's instruction to us. God has in the Logos taught us how to live so as to be happy. And they had heard Him. "Whom" is preferable to "which" as in K. J. It represents a personal relation. This is similar to what Paul says in Rom. 10:14. "How shall

they call upon him into whom they have not believed? And how shall they believe him whom they have not heard? And how shall they hear without (he) speaking?" He must hear Jesus himself in order to know Him. We can otherwise only know about Him. We are to "know Him" in order that we may have eternal life - for "eternal life is to know Him, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom He has sent." John could add nothing to the Logos, as he could truly say that what he was writing was that which they already had heard - the Logos which was from the beginning. The text may omit the phrase - "from the beginning" at the close of the verse. They had not heard the Logos from the beginning, but as in Cap. 1:1. "What was from the beginning" i.e. the Logos, they had heard.

Ver. 8. "Again (or on the other hand) I write unto you new instruction". Does John here contradict what he had said in the preceding verse? Not at all. While it is true that he has not added any outward teaching in this letter to what had given in the Gospel, yet he has given us here

an inner development of that outward teaching which is new, and will always continue to be new, and to this he calls their attention.

— "which is true in him and in you". The relative "which" refers here to the content of the "new instruction". The content of this new teaching is true in Him and in us. He would have expected John to have said "us" instead of "you". The content of this "new instruction" is:

— "Darkness is passing away and the true light is already appearing". The present tense indicates a continuous process. Not that light appeared at one time and then ceased, but that it is shining continuously, and expelling the darkness. It is this that John says "is true in him and in you". This is a remarkable statement. How is it true in Him? Christ in His own life passed through this same process of development that we do. He "barned", He "grew", He "increased", and such like phrases indicate this clearly.

For is this all a thing of the past. Paul says that he "was filling up that which is lacking of the affliction of Christ in my flesh for his body's sake, which is the Church." Col. 1:24. His sufferings then are not all past. He

are in Him and there is an intimate relation between Christ and us. "Ye are the body of Christ", and that body is not yet perfected. So it "is true in Him".

This does not mean that God had not sent any light to men before this time. He has always been doing so since man's creation, and as soon as God began to send light, darkness began to pass away. It has been a slow process, but it is God's work. The trouble with us is that we "love darkness rather than light", and "will not come to the light". Whenever new light comes it brings us a higher revelation - i.e. a deeper insight into the Logos, so that this is "new instruction". There are many things in the Bible which are new to us, though we have read over the words many times. Have you thought that darkness is passing out of your own life? "I am the one making all things new". We become a "new man" and yet we are the same individual that we were before. This is the great mystery.

V. 9. "The one saying, he is in the light and

hating his brother, is in darkness until now?"

This is the deduction that John draws from the preceding statements. It must manifest itself in the life. One cannot be in the light and hate his brother at the same time. When hate enters the heart darkness enters with it and light departs.

Ver. 10. "The one loving his brother remains in the light, and scandal is not in him." Light and love are joined together. Do we comprehend all there is in love? Love is the law of life. We have many false notions about love. Genuine love is to desire the highest good for a person.

There is no chance for deception with such a test as we have here. If it were "kindness" it would be easier, for we can appear kind when there is no real affection, but with love that would be difficult.

Ver. 11. "The one hating his brother is in darkness, and walks in darkness, and does not know where he goes, because the darkness hath blinded his eyes." He not only is "in the darkness" but he walks in it - i.e. he does the things which belong to the realm of darkness. He does not know where he goes, because the darkness hath blinded his eyes. He may think he is

alight. "Eyes" are used here not for the
 physical organs of sight, but rather for that
 power of soul to discern the right from
 the wrong. Here it is said that "the dark-
 ness hath blinded his eyes", while Paul
 in II. Thes. 2: 8-12, represents God as sending
 strong delusions in order that they should
 believe a lie, and be condemned, who will
 not believe the truth, but have pleasure
 in unrighteousness. —